

# Gravity limits the kinetic energy of a massive elementary particle

Justin C. Feng<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Leung Center for Cosmology and Particle Astrophysics, National Taiwan University,  
No.1 Sec.4, Roosevelt Rd., Taipei 10617, Taiwan, Republic of China*

In this note, I argue that tidal effects generically limit the kinetic energy of a single massive elementary particle in the vicinity of a compact object. As the kinetic energy is increased, the differences in the tidal potential over a Compton wavelength will at some point exceed the rest mass of the particle. Above the threshold, one expects tidal effects to disrupt single-particle states, and in turn, one might expect an incident particle scattering off a compact object with an energy significantly exceeding the threshold to result in a shower of lower energy particles. A calculation reveals that the threshold for neutrinos scattering off a  $10M_\odot$  black hole within three Schwarzschild radii is roughly 1 GeV.

Various authors have pointed out that gravitational effects can be greatly amplified in the frame of an observer moving close to the speed of light [1–6]. In particular, Mashhoon pointed out that gravitational tidal forces can tear apart sufficiently fast-moving composite particles [7]. One might wonder what happens for individual *elementary* particles. In this note, I show that if a single massive elementary particle on a scattering trajectory exceeds a threshold kinetic energy in the vicinity of a gravitating compact object, the tidal energy differences across a Compton wavelength in the frame of the particle exceed the rest energy of the particle. This suggests that single-particle states are strongly disrupted above this threshold, and one might expect such a disruption to result in a multi-particle state at late times.

Consider the scattering of a massive particle from a spherically symmetric compact object of mass  $M$  described by the Schwarzschild line element (setting  $c = G = 1$  for now):

$$ds^2 = -f dt^2 + dr^2/f + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2), \quad (1)$$

with  $f = 1 - 2M/r$ . The trajectory of the scattered particle is a timelike geodesic  $x^\mu = x^\mu(\tau)$  in the equatorial plane  $\theta = \pi/2$ , parameterized by proper time  $\tau$ . The four-velocity is (the overdot denotes  $d/d\tau$ ):

$$u^a := \frac{dx^a(\tau)}{d\tau} = (e/f, \dot{r}, 0, l/r^2), \quad (2)$$

and the invariants of the motion are:

$$e = \dot{t}f, \quad l = r^2\dot{\phi}. \quad (3)$$

The conserved quantities  $e$  and  $l$  are the respective specific (per unit rest mass) kinetic energy and angular momentum of the particle, which approach their special relativistic values when  $r \gg 2M$ . The trajectory  $r(\phi)$  in the equatorial plane can be found by performing an integral constructed from the unit norm condition  $u_\mu u^\mu = -1$ . However, for simplicity, I consider only the value of  $u^\mu$  at the point of closest approach, which satisfies the condition  $\dot{r} = 0$ , and is the point along the scattering trajectory where gravitational effects are the strongest. It

is straightforward to show that the radius of closest approach  $r_0$  is greater than the photon radius ( $r_0 > 3M$ ), and is related to the invariants by the formula:

$$l\sqrt{r_0 - 2M} = r_0\sqrt{(e^2 - 1)r_0 + 2M}. \quad (4)$$

Tidal accelerations in the frame of the observer traveling along the aforementioned geodesic can be computed with the geodesic deviation equation [8]:

$$a^\mu = R^\mu{}_{\rho\sigma\nu} u^\rho u^\sigma z^\nu, \quad (5)$$

where  $R^\mu{}_{\rho\sigma\nu}$  is the Riemann tensor and  $z^\mu$  is a vector field (satisfying  $u_\mu z^\mu = 0$ ) representing the displacement to a neighboring geodesic that is initially parallel to  $x^\mu(\tau)$ . The quantity  $a^\mu := u^\rho \nabla_\rho (u^\sigma \nabla_\sigma z^\mu)$  is the relative acceleration between the two geodesics—here,  $u^\mu$  represents a four-velocity field of initially parallel geodesics in the neighborhood of  $x^\mu(\tau)$ . Now writing  $z^\mu = \varepsilon \hat{z}^\mu$ , where  $\hat{z}^\mu$  is a unit vector and  $\varepsilon$  is the separation distance, one can compute the magnitude of the acceleration in the  $\hat{z}^\mu$  direction. For large  $e \gg 1$ , and at  $r_0$ , the transverse acceleration dominates, with (orthonormal basis) components in the geodesic rest frame [9]:

$$a_r \approx \frac{3e^2 \varepsilon_r}{(s-2)s^2 M^2}, \quad a_\theta \approx -\frac{3e^2 \varepsilon_\theta}{(s-2)s^2 M^2}, \quad (6)$$

where  $s := r_0/M$ ,  $a_r$  and  $a_\theta$  are the acceleration magnitudes, and  $\varepsilon_r$  and  $\varepsilon_\theta$  are the components of  $z^\mu$  in the respective  $r$  and  $\theta$  directions. The signs indicate that neighboring geodesics focus in the  $\theta$  direction and defocus in the  $r$  direction. Though the result in Eq. (6) is valid for any scattering trajectory in the limit  $e \gg 1$ , the tidal acceleration can become independent of  $e$  in special instances—a timelike geodesic with a strictly radial component is one example [7, 10].

From the tidal acceleration, one can infer a tidal potential by integrating Eq. (6); a more general approach for constructing a tidal potential may be found in [11]. Reintroducing factors of  $c$  and  $G$ , the potential is:

$$\Phi = -\frac{c^2}{G^2} \frac{3e^2(\varepsilon_r^2 - \varepsilon_\theta^2)}{2(s-2)s^2 M^2}. \quad (7)$$

The potential  $\Phi$  may be interpreted as a specific potential energy. Now consider what happens when  $\varepsilon_i$  is the characteristic size of a particle of mass  $m$ . If the particle is composite, then when  $m|\Phi|$  exceeds the binding energy of the particle, the tidal forces will break it apart, as pointed out in [7]. If the particle is elementary, then  $\varepsilon_i$  is on the order of the Compton wavelength of the particle, and when  $|\Phi| \gtrsim c^2$ , the energy differences over the Compton wavelength  $2\pi\hbar/mc$  exceed the rest energy of the particle. Setting  $\varepsilon_\theta = 0$ , one may obtain a rough limit for the specific energy:

$$e \lesssim c^2 s \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}(s-2)} \frac{Mm}{2\pi m_{\text{Pl}}^2}, \quad (8)$$

where  $m_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar c/G}$  is the Planck mass. Fundamentally, particles in flat spacetime are described as energy-quantized excitations of a quantum field (for a specified momentum), and one might intuitively expect energy differences exceeding the rest mass to result in particle creation. However, since the spacetime geometry is held fixed and admits a timelike Killing vector, one expects the energy expectation values to be conserved (note also that  $\Phi$  changes sign). Still, these considerations indicate that beyond this threshold, incident single-particle states are strongly disrupted by tidal effects, and one might expect such states to generically evolve into multiparticle states at late times. Energy conservation then dictates that the resulting particles each have reduced kinetic energies compared to the incident particle.

Neutrinos scattering near the photon radius of stellar-mass black holes experience a particularly strong disruption. Neutrinos have a mass sum on the order of  $\sim 0.1 \text{ eV}/c^2$  [12], and near the photon radius  $s = 3$  of a  $10M_\odot$  black hole, Eq. (8) yields (after multiplying by the mass sum) a threshold for individual neutrinos of roughly  $E \lesssim 0.3 \text{ GeV}$ , and for  $s = 6$ , this increases to just over  $1 \text{ GeV}$ . For neutrinos passing within a radius  $s = 6$  of a  $10^6 M_\odot$  black hole (on the order of Sgr A\*), the threshold increases to  $E \lesssim 100 \text{ TeV}$  (scaling linearly in  $M$ ), an order of magnitude lower than the highest energy neutrinos detected by the IceCube observatory [13].

I comment on some implications for future neutrino observations. One may expect the scattering of a cosmic ray neutrino passing close to the photon radius of a black hole and greatly exceeding the threshold energy to result in a shower of neutrinos with energies lower than the incident particle, so that the spectrum of neutrinos from the vicinity of a black hole differs significantly from the background above the threshold. More generally, one might expect strong tidal effects on neutrinos to result in some spectral feature near the threshold, whether it be a peak, a strong suppression above the threshold, or something else. Since the threshold depends on the mass of individual neutrinos, such spectral features may permit separate constraints on neutrino masses for each generation.

I leave the reader with some questions for future investigation. The first concerns a more rigorous analysis of the scattering process in the framework of quantum field theory in curved spacetime, but such a task may be nontrivial due to the highly curved and dynamical spacetime environment in the Fermi normal frame of the scattering trajectories. The second concerns the question of an analogous effect for massless elementary particles (the related issue of wave-particle duality is discussed in [10]). The third concerns the case of extreme mass ratio scattering between black holes; one might expect no limit on the kinetic energy or relative velocity for classical black holes since they can neither break apart nor decay, but the behavior of a black hole under extreme tidal deformation may require a numerical analysis. The fourth is whether these considerations yield insights into the idea that gravitational effects may serve as a universal regulator for quantum field theory (see [14] and Sec. 5.3 of [15] for brief reviews of such proposals).

*Acknowledgements* — I thank Jiwoo Nam for discussions on neutrino physics and acknowledge support from the R.O.C. (Taiwan) National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) grant No. 112-2811-M-002-132.

---

\* jcfeng@ntu.edu.tw

- [1] F. A. E. Pirani, Proc. R. Soc. A **252**, 96 (1959).
- [2] P. Aichelburg and R. Sexl, Lett. Nuovo Cimento (1969-1970) **4**, 1316 (1970); Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **2**, 303 (1971).
- [3] G. Curtis, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **9**, 999 (1978).
- [4] P. D'Eath, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 990 (1978); P. D'Eath and P. Payne, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 658 (1992).
- [5] B. Mashhoon and J. C. McClune, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **262**, 881 (1993).
- [6] R. Plyatsko and M. Fenyk, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 044047 (2016), arXiv:1610.01545 [gr-qc].
- [7] B. Mashhoon, Phys. Lett. A **163**, 7 (1992).
- [8] R. Wald, *General Relativity* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984); F. A. E. Pirani, Acta Phys. Polon. **15**, 389 (1956).
- [9] J. C. Feng and C. Reiss, (2024), *In preparation*.
- [10] B. Mashhoon, Phys. Lett. A **122**, 299 (1987).
- [11] B. Mashhoon, Astrophys. J. **197**, 705 (1975).
- [12] R. L. Workman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [13] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* (IceCube), Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 021103 (2013), arXiv:1304.5356 [astro-ph.HE]; P. Padovani, P. Giommi, E. Resconi, T. Glauch, B. Arsioli, N. Sahakyan, and M. Huber, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **480**, 192 (2018), arXiv:1807.04461 [astro-ph.HE].
- [14] R. Casadio, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **174**, 012058 (2009), arXiv:0902.2939 [gr-qc].
- [15] S. Carlip, Rept. Prog. Phys. **86**, 066001 (2023), arXiv:2209.14282 [gr-qc].